STATE OF CALIFORNIA

CALIFORNIA INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD

Base Year Modification Request Certification

Part 1: Generation Study - No Extrapolation Diversion Data

To request a substitution for a previously approved base-year used in calculating the diversion rate for your jurisdiction, please complete and sign this form and return it to your Office of Local Assistance (OLA) representative at the address below, along with any additional information requested by OLA staff. When all documentation has been received, your OLA representative will work with you to prepare for your appearance before the Board. If you have any questions about this process, please call (916) 341-6199 to be connected to your OLA representative.

Mail completed documents to:

California Integrated Waste Management Board
Office of Local Assistance
1001 I Street, 9th Floor
PO Box 4025
Sacramento, CA 95812-4025

General Instructions:

Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your request to the Board.

- Use a recent generation-based study to calculate our current reporting-year generation amount, but not officially change our existing Board-approved base year.
- X 2. Use a recent generation-based study to officially change our existing Board-approved base year to a new base year.

The cells on these sheets are protected except for the ones that need information. If you have problems using these sheets, please contact your Office of Local Assistance representative.

	y of perjury that the info I am authorized to mak				correct to	the best of my
Jurisdiction Name		Co	unty			*
El Dorado County U	Inincorporated	EI	Dorado Co	ounty		
Authorized Signature	M_	Titl De	e partment	Director		
Type/Print Name of Perso	ø∕Signing	Da	Date Phone ()			
Jon Morgan			12/13	104	(530) 6	21-5360
Person Completing This F	orm (please print or type)	Titl		- W		
Jon Souza/Jim Greco		Sol	d Waste Div	ision/Owner-	Principal	
Affiliation: Environme	ental Management Departme	nt/California Waste	Associates	. 50		The state of the s
Mailing Address		City	T	Stat	te	ZIP Code
2850 Fairlane Court, Build	ing C	Placerviil	Placerviile CA 95667			95667

occupii ili ililorimadon for fron Sonera	tion-Based Stud	dy for Existing or New Base Year	72 2 22			
Attach additional sheets if necessary—	- reference eacl	n response to the appropriate cell nur	nber (e.g., 4).			
Note: New base years must be represent	ative of a jurisdic	tion's disposal and diversion.				
Current Board-approved base-year:		2. Proposed new generation-based study year:				
1990		2003				
		Annal Control				
	t d	recentative of average appual jurisdiction	n disposal and			
3. Explain how the proposed generation s	study year is repr	esentative of average arrival junioriotics	Talepoola and			
<u>diversion:</u> The County has contacted a number of w	aste generators	and obtained information about diversio	n programs, including,			
in many again waighed and/or estimater	tonnage The p	roposed new base year reflects the mos	t complete ellort to			
data to identify diversion activities and to	quantify their pe	rformance. The County feels that the ac-	curacy of the diversion			
study is comparable to prior studies prep	ared in northern	California and approved by the CIWMB	and may even surpass			
the comprehensiveness and accuracy of	prior studies.					
4. Enter your diversion rates below.						
Diversion rate calculated using	T	Diversion rate calculated using nev	v			
existing base year	a. 25 %	generation-based study	b. 56.3 %			
	a. 25 /0	For new generation based study				
For existing base year		pounds/person/day based on				
pounds/person/day based on generation	5.9	generation	10.0			
deneration	0.0					
	tial	Residential Non-Resid	lential			
Residential Non-Residen			tion 72%			
Residential Non-Resident generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based	n 38% study 96,123	Residential Non-Residence generation 28% General Population new generation-based states.	tion 72% study 134,400			
Residential Non-Resident generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and	study 96,123 4b. please expla	Residential Non-Residence generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistent.	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your			
Residential Non-Resident generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts.	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed in	Residential Non-Residence generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistence generation tonnage results in an incompared to the sain and	study 134,400 tent with your crease in your			
Residential Non-Resident generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent	Residential generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistent generation tonnage results in an inclusion with your current diversion implementation.	study 134,400 tent with your crease in your			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent the demographics	Residential Non-Residence generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistence generation tonnage results in an incommon with your current diversion implementation.	study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth signal. This per capita is well below the same properties of the county has experienced rapid growth signal.	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics nee 1990. The original tratewide average	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistent of the same of the	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. nts (9.0 ppd). During the			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the sequencing of many businesses and other order.	study 96,123 4b, please explaints is consistent is consistent in demographics in the proposed of the proposed	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistency generation tonnage results in an inclusion with your current diversion implementation. In the same apparent that the original data, it became apparent that the original generation 28 data, it became apparent that the original generation 28 data.	tion 72% tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. nts (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth sit 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other organization and the county has experienced rapid growth sit 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other organization and the county of diversion occurred the amount of diversion occurred the diversion occu	study 96,123 4b, please explaints is consistent is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The oriestatewide average panizations for 200 curring in the united	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistency generation tonnage results in an inclusion with your current diversion implementation. In the same apparent that the original corporated area. Additionally, the rapid grows are generated area.	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. nts (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occard the popresidential sector resulted in increase.	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The oriestatewide average panizations for 200 curring in the unince teased reporting in the	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistency generation tonnage results in an inclusion with your current diversion implementation. In the second of	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in you			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occurred the county did not accurately estimate was proposed to the county did not accurately estimate to the county did not accurately estimate to th	study 96,123 4b, please explaints is consistent is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The oriestatewide average panizations for 200 curring in the unince teased reporting years an experience in the state of the consistence in the unince teased reporting years are generation in the unince teased reporting years are generation in the unince teased reporting years.	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistency generation tonnage results in an inclusion with your current diversion implementation. In the second of	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. nts (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study of the in the housing market to the adjustment essents a more accurate			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts, pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occand the nonresidential sector resulted in incomethodology did not accurately estimate way estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics in the proposed of the pro	Residential generation 28% General generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consist new generation tonnage results in an inclusive with your current diversion implemental strength of the same apparent that the original corporated area. Additionally, the rapid grow ear waste generation. The County feels that reporting years. The new diversion rate repression in generation of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population is same population of diversion in the county feels that	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market the adjustment esents a more accurate			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occurred the county did not accurately estimate was proposed to the county did not accurately estimate to the county did not accurately estimate to th	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics in the proposed of the pro	Residential generation 28% General generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consist new generation tonnage results in an inclusive with your current diversion implemental strength of the same apparent that the original corporated area. Additionally, the rapid grow ear waste generation. The County feels that reporting years. The new diversion rate repression in generation of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population of diversion in the county feels that the same population is same population of diversion in the county feels that	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market the adjustment esents a more accurate			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion ocand the nonresidential sector resulted in incomethodology did not accurately estimate wa estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen come	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The original transfer and the unince the statewide average panizations for 200 curring in the unince eased reporting years generation in respect to the new WGs pliance with AB 90 constant in the proposed in the propose	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based stain how the new diversion rate is consistent of the state o	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market to the adjustment essents a more accurate programs focused on the			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts. pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occurrent diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen come. 6. If the difference between the proposed	study 96,123 4b, please explaints is consistent is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The oriestatewide average panizations for 200 curring in the unince ased reporting years of the new WGs pliance with AB 9.	Residential generation 28% Generation 28% Generation 28% Generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consistency generation tonnage results in an inclusion with your current diversion implementation. With your current diversion implementation of the properties of the proper	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. nts (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market t the adjustment essents a more accurate programs focused on the			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts, pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occand the nonresidential sector resulted in incomethodology did not accurately estimate wa estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimate was estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurately estimated the amount of diversion occan did not accurat	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The original that is demographics in the unince an ince 1990 in the unince and reporting in the unince ased reporting years of the new WG pliance with AB 9. In the control of the new WG pliance with AB 9. In the control of the new WG pliance with AB 9. In the control of the new WG pliance with AB 9. In the control of the control	Residential generation 28% General generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consist new generation tonnage results in an incomplemental street with your current diversion implemental street generation to the sain and	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study orth in the housing market t the adjustment esents a more accurate programs focused on the ge points, please programs.)			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts, pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occand the nonresidential sector resulted in incomethodology did not accurately estimate wa estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimated in income the difference between the proposed explain the specific reasons for the difference in diversion rates.	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics in the proposed of this is consistent is demographics in the unince 1990. The original thin the unince the proposed of the	Residential generation 28% General generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consist new generation tonnage results in an incomplemental street with your current diversion implemental street generation to the sain and	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market to the adjustment esents a more accurate programs focused on the ge points, please programs.) inition of diversion aste generation amount			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts, pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occand the nonresidential sector resulted in incomethodology did not accurately estimate wa estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen come for the difference between the proposed explain the specific reasons for the difference in the nonresidential sector. The which was under-estimated in 1990. Additional current in the nonresidential sector. The which was under-estimated in 1990. Additional current in the nonresidential sector. The which was under-estimated in 1990. Additional current in the nonresidential sector. The which was under-estimated in 1990. Additional current in the nonresidential sector. The which was under-estimated in 1990. Additional current in the nonresidential sector.	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics in the proposed of this is consistent is demographics in the unince 1990. The original thin the unince the proposed of the	Residential generation 28% General generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consist new generation tonnage results in an incomplemental sain with your current diversion implemental sain ginal base year was under-estimated, result for 1990 base year waste generation amout 30 data, it became apparent that the original corporated area. Additionally, the rapid grow ear waste generation. The County feels that reporting years. The new diversion rate reports will facilitate implementation of diversion particular in the proving sain sain facilitate implementation of diversion particular in the proving sain sain sain sain sain sain sain sain	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market the adjustment esents a more accurate programs focused on the ge points, please programs.) inition of diversion aste generation amount experiting year waste			
Residential generation 62% Generation Population existing generation-based 5. If there is an increase between 4a and current diversion implementation efforts, pounds/person/day, please explain how any examples, e.g. change in jurisdiction The County has experienced rapid growth si 5.92 ppd). This per capita is well below the surveying of many businesses and other orgunder-estimated the amount of diversion occand the nonresidential sector resulted in incomethodology did not accurately estimate wa estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimate of diversion performance. Furtherm residential sector, which will strengthen comethodology did not accurately estimate was estimated in income the difference between the proposed explain the specific reasons for the difference in diversion rates.	study 96,123 4b, please explain the proposed of this is consistent is demographics ince 1990. The original thin the unince and the unince an	Residential generation 28% General generation 28% General Population new generation-based sain how the new diversion rate is consist new generation tonnage results in an including with your current diversion implementates. It is ginal base year was under-estimated, result for 1990 base year waste generation amout 30 data, it became apparent that the original corporated area. Additionally, the rapid growear waste generation. The County feels that reporting years. The new diversion rate reports will facilitate implementation of diversion particularly. In the analysis of the provided in the sector in 2004 about diversion program implementation of 28% of the provided in the sector in 2004 about diversion program implementation of 28% of the provided in the sector in 2004 about diversion program implementation of 28% of the provided in the provided in the sector in 2004 about diversion program implementation of 28% of the provided in	tion 72% study 134,400 tent with your crease in your tion efforts and provide ting in a low per capita (e.g. ints (9.0 ppd). During the waste generation study with in the housing market to the adjustment essents a more accurate programs focused on the ge points, please programs.) intion of diversion aste generation amount experience reporting year waste ementation in 2003, it was			

7. Disposal Tonnage: (enter values)	50,769	56,763	107,532
	Residential	Non-Residential	Total

Please select the ONE choice below that best explains your disposal data and complete the required tables.

- X a. All tons claimed are from the Board's Disposal Reporting System (No explanation required. Go to Section 8.)
- b. All tons claimed are from a 100 percent audit of hauler and self-haul tonnage. (Please complete Reporting Year Tonnage Request and Modification Certification sheet found at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/lgcentral/forms/rytnmdrq.doc)
- c. Some Disposal Reporting System data were corrected. (Please complete Reporting Year Tonnage Modification Request and Certification sheet found at http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/lgcentral/forms/rytnmdrq.doc)
- 8. In the table below, list the summarized diversion activities, and diversion data records that support your claim and are available for Board audit. (Note: The Board expects the jurisdictions to be able to provide all back-up documentation, if requested) Include type of record and location—for example, weight tickets from transfer stations. This section should capture all diversion tonnage (form will perform all addition calculations). If any diversion is from restricted wastes, [agricultural wastes, inert solids (e.g., concrete, asphalt, dirt, etc.), white goods, and scrap metal] please identify those programs/waste types and fill out section 10. Please mark as Attachment 8 all copies of survey forms.

*Please provide detailed non-Residential waste audit information in Section 9.

	Actual tons	Relative Percent to Total Generation	Specific material type's) (List operation w/multiple materials in one box)	Specific conversion factor used (if any) and Source	Type of record and location of record
Please use the Board's program types. The program type glossary is online at: http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/lgcentral/paris/codes/reduce.htm	(A)	(A/Total Generation)			
Residential Activities:					
Source Reduction					
Backyard Composting (PARIS 1010)	0.00	0.00%	Grass, leaves, branches	No data obtained	N/A
Other Residential source reduction (Donated produce	Grocer A	ISuprey form/EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060)	8.00	0.00%	Donated produce	Grocer A	Survey form/EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060) MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060)	8.00 158.00	0.00%	Donated food	Food Bank of EDC	Letter/EDC EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060) MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060) MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060)	8.00 158.00 29.00	0.00% 0.06% 0.01%	Donated food Donated building materials	Food Bank of EDC Habitat for Humanity	Letter/EDC EMD Grant report/EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060)	8.00 158.00 29.00 23.00	0.00% 0.06% 0.01% 0.01%	Donated food Donated building materials Household Goods	Food Bank of EDC Habitat for Humanity WERS Reuse Store	Letter/EDC EMD Grant report/EMD Monthly logs/EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060)	8.00 158.00 29.00	0.00% 0.06% 0.01%	Donated food Donated building materials	Food Bank of EDC Habitat for Humanity	Letter/EDC EMD Grant report/EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060)	8.00 158.00 29.00 23.00	0.00% 0.06% 0.01% 0.01%	Donated food Donated building materials Household Goods	Food Bank of EDC Habitat for Humanity WERS Reuse Store	Letter/EDC EMD Grant report/EMD Monthly logs/EMD
MEF, Thrift, Reuse (PARIS 1060) Subtotal Residential Source	8.00 158.00 29.00 23.00 3,896.00 4,114.00	0.00% 0.06% 0.01% 0.01% 1.58%	Donated food Donated building materials Household Goods	Food Bank of EDC Habitat for Humanity WERS Reuse Store	Letter/EDC EMD Grant report/EMD Monthly logs/EMD

Buyback Centers (PARIS 2020)	2,941.00	1.19%	CRV containers	Source: DOC	Letter, report (Couty)
Other Residential recycling ☐ (list ea	ch program sep	parately)			
Spcl Collection Events (PARIS 2080)			THE STATE OF THE S	Committee and the second	
oper concedent Events (174 the Ecce)	242.00	0.10%	CRT's	Special Events (Grant funded)	EDC EMD
Special/Xmas Trees (PARIS 2070)				300 trees @ 30 lbs/tree by	
,	2.00	0.00%	Christmas Trees	Hensley Rec Area	County
Other Recycling (PARIS 2090)					
	36.00	0.01%	News, mixed paper	St. Stephen's Lutheran Church	EDC EMD
Scrap Metals (PARIS 4040)	88.00	0.04%	Scrap metals, tin	2 MRF operations, records	EDC EMD
Wood (PARIS 4050)	334.00	0.14%	Wood waste	STR MRF	EDC EMD
Asphalt/Concrete (PARIS 4060)	299.00	0.12%	Rubble from remodels	STR MRF	EDC EMD
MRF (PARIS 7000)	T		CB, mixed paper, metals, other	3 MRF's - operator records	Kina I al I
	3,592.00	1.46%	recyclable commodities	based on weighed loads	MRF Operator, County
ADC (PARIS 7040)	17.00	0.01%	Green waste	3 landfills per CIWMB DRS	CIWMB DRS
Subtotal Residential Recycling	13,356.00	5.42%			
Composting					
Composung				IEDOL	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000)	0.00	0.00%	Green waste	EDSI monthly reports	
	1,245.00	0.51%	Green waste Green waste, brush	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070)	1,245.00	0.51%			
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070)	1,245.00 each program se	0.51% eparately)	Green waste, brush	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting	1,245.00 each program se	0.51% eparately) 0.07%	Green waste, brush	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57%	Green waste, brush	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00 18,879.00	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57%	Green waste, brush	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion Non-Residential Activities:	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00 18,879.00	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57%	Green waste, brush	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion Non-Residential Activities: Source Reduction	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00 18,879.00	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57% 7.67%	Green waste, brush Horse manure	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion Non-Residential Activities: Source Reduction Non-Residential Waste Audits*	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00 18,879.00	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57% 7.67%	Horse manure ately)	Fire Safe Council records Rancher	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion Non-Residential Activities: Source Reduction Non-Residential Waste Audits*	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00 18,879.00	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57% 7.67%	Green waste, brush Horse manure	Fire Safe Council records	EDC EMD
Curbside GW (PARIS 3000) Other/Chip & Grind (PARIS 3070) Other Residential composting (list e Other Composting/Manure (PARIS 3070) Subtotal Residential Composting Subtotal Residential Diversion Non-Residential Activities: Source Reduction Non-Residential Waste Audits* Other non-Residential source reduction	1,245.00 each program se 164.00 1,409.00 18,879.00 10 10.00 tion (list each pr	0.51% eparately) 0.07% 0.57% 7.67% 0.00% rogram separ	Green waste, brush Horse manure ately) Grass clippings - 10 golf courses, state park, 2 CSD's,	Rancher 0.1466 tons/week, 852.61 mowable acres. Source:	EDC EMD EDC EMD Survey forms, supporting records (County).

Non-Residential Waste Audits*	0.00	0.00%			SCENERAL STATES
Other non-Residential recycling (list	each program	separately)			
Buyback Centers (PARIS 2020)	735.00	0.30%	CRV beverage containers	DOC Letter; MRF nonres split	EDC EMD
Commercial Onsite P/U (PARIS 2030)	98.00	0.04%	Mixed paper	Coleictor A, M.O.R.E	EDC EMD
Special Events (PARIS 2080)	424.00	0.17%	Multiple	EDSI/WERS Cleanup	EDC EMD
Other/Recyclers (PARIS 2090)	1,164.00	0.47%	CB, MP, Plastic film	Retail store, grocers, church	EDC EMD
MRF (PARIS 7000)	7,896.00	3.21%	Paper	Paper recycler (weighed)	EDC EMD
MRF (PARIS 7000)	1,183.00	0.48%	CB, mixed paper, metals, other recyclable commodities	Facility operator records based on weighed loads	MRF Operator, County
Landfill Diversion (PARIS 7010)	1,964.00	0.80%	Various	Kiefer LF (weighed)	Sac County, EDC EMD
Transfer Station (PARIS 7020)	35.00	0.01%	Various	NARS (weighed)	Sac County, EDC EMD
ADC (PARIS 7040)	15.00	0.01%	Green Waste	CIWMB DRS	CIWMB, EDC EMD
Subtotal Non-Residential Recycling	13,514.00	5.49%			
Composting					
Non-Residential Waste Audits*	0.00	0.00%			
Other non-Residential composting (li	ist each progra	m separately			
Food Waste Composting (3070)	319.00	0.13%	Food waste	Grocers	EDC EMD
Other Composting/Chip & Grind (3070)	24,243.00	9.85%	Brush - chip and grind	Lumber products company, EDC DOT and Parks Depts, tree trimming companies	EDC EMD
Compost Facility (PARIS 7030)	1,635.00	0.66%	Green waste	Organic matls processor	EDC EMD
Compost Facility (FARIS 7030)	1,000.00	0.0078	Oreen waste	Organic matis processor	EDC EIVID
Subtotal Non-Residential Composting	26,197.00	10.64%			
	26,197.00 45,278.00	10.64%			
Composting Subtotal Non-Residential Diversion Residential/Non- Residential					
Composting Subtotal Non-Residential Diversion			Sludge	2 WWTP's land application	EDC EMD

Scrap Metal (PARIS 4040)	2,394.00	0.97%	Scrap metals	Weight tickets by MRF operators	EDC EMD
Wood Waste (PARIS 4050)	51,338.00	20.85%	Wood waste, lumber byproducts	Lumber products company, MRF;s, retail store	EDC EMD
Rubble/Asphalt/Concrete (4060)	4,000.00	1.62%	Broken asphalt and concrete	Inerts recycler	EDC EMD
Rubble/Asphalt/Concrete (4060)	2,500.00	1.02%	Broken asphalt and concrete	EDC DOT records (road work)	EDC EMD
Rubble/Asphalt/Concrete (4060)	883.00	0.36%	Broken asphalt and concrete	Construction contractor	EDC EMD
Rubble/Asphalt/Concrete (4060)	4,958.00	2.01%	Broken, returned concrete	2 MRF operations, records	EDC EMD
Rendering (PARIS 4090)	695.00	0.28%	Bone, fat, grease, vegetable	2 grocers, 3 renderers	EDC EMD
Subtotal Residential/Non-Residential diversion	74,536.00	30.27%	e de les appenents de la lace de lace de la lace de lace de lace de lace de la lace de la lace de la lace de la lace de lace		
Total Diversion Tons	138,693.00	56.33%			
Total Disposal Tons from Sec.7	107,532.00	43.67%	eleney) 3F10i0	00.30	
Total Generation Tons (Div+Dis)	246,225.00			Total Section	organisational Island

9. Specific Non-Residential Sector Waste Audits-Top 10 Non-Residential Generators

Please complete this table for the top 10 non-residential generators that were surveyed. List each non-residential generator separately from largest to smallest, based on total diversion tons. Audit reference number ties to your audit sheets.

(Form will perform all addition calculations).

Please provide an attachment 9 which includes all of the generators surveyed. Include for each generator (use type of generator in lieu of specific business name) diversion activity and material type and associated tonnage for each diversion activity/material type. Include copies of survey form(s) used.

Type of Non-residential Generator	Audit Reference Number *	Specific/Major Diversion Activities include material type (e.g. paper recycling, grasscycling). (List activities on one line)	Source Reduction Tons	Recycling Tons	Composting Tons	Total Diversion Tons	Percent of Total Generation (Total Diversion Tons/Total Generation in Section 8)	Survey Method Phone (P) Mail (M) On-site (O) Other
Lumber Products Co	1	Wood waste (bark, chips, shavings, sawdust)		50737.00	23210.00	73947.00	30.0%	P, M, O
Snowline Hospice	7	Household Items, Clothing, Toys	3896.00			3896.00	1.6%	P, M
Serrano Country Club	12	Grass	1164.00			1164.00	0.5%	P.M
Bass Lake Golf Course	13	Grass	956.00			956.00	0.4%	P, M
Construction Contractor	14	Rubble, roofing, tiles, wood		883.00		883.00	0.4%	P, M, O
Grocer B	15	Produce, CB, Plastic, Grease	52.00	508.00	101.00	661.00	0.3%	P, M
Food Bank of EDC	17	Food Donations	634.00			634.00	0.3%	P, M, O
Grocer C	19	Produce, CB, Plastic, Grease		323.00	218.00	541.00	0.2%	P, M
Cold Springs Golf & CC	20	Grass	520.00			520.00	0.2%	P, M
Cameron Park CC	21	Grass	467.00			467.00	0.2%	P, M
Apple Mountain GC	23	Grass	331.00			331.00	0.1%	P, M
Totals			8020.00	52451.00	23529.00	84000.00	34.1%	

^{*} Please see Table 3 and Section 5.0 in the report titled "County of El Dorado Solid Waste Generation Study for 2003" dated November 17, 2004.

Table 1. Summary of 2003 Waste Generation Study for Unincorporated El Dorado County

Agenda Item 3 Attachment 2a

Total Source Reduction	#	Component/Program	PARIS	Tons					Method/Conversion		Business/Organization
2 Xeri/Grasscycling		Source Reduction	materia.							177123	
2 Xeri/Grasscycling	1	Xeri/Grasscycling	1000	331	0.1%	0%	0	Grass	75 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 30 wks	SH, VK	Apple Mt Golf Resort
3 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 467 0.2% 0.9% 0 Grass 106 acres x 0.147 Vah x 3.0 wks SH, VK Cameron Park CCD			1000	956	0.4%	0%	0	Grass	130 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 50 wks	SH, VK	Bass Lake Golf Course
A Xeri/Grasscycling			1000	467	0.2%	0%	0	Grass	106 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 30 wks	SH, VK	Cameron Park CC
S CerriGrasscycling 1000 159 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 35 acres x 0.147 Valw x 30 wks S Cold Springs Golf and CC			1000	221	0.1%	0%	0	Grass	30 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 50 wks	JS	Cameron Park CSD
6 Kerl/Grasscycling 1000 520 0.2% 0% 0 Grass 68 acres x 0.147 Valw x 52 wks JS EDC DOT Property			1000	159	0.1%	0%	0	Grass	35 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 30 wks	SH, VK	Camino Heights GC
To Exercises To Control To			1000	520	0.2%	0%	0	Grass	68 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 52 wks	JS	Cold Springs Golf and CC
8 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 110 0.0% 0% 0 Grass 18/30 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 40/1 wks SH, VK EDC Parks & Recreation Series Series series v 0.147 Yalw x 30 wks JS EDH Golf Course 10 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 219 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 35.5 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 42 wks JS EDH Golf Course 11 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 162 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 53 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 22 wks JS EDH Golf Course 12 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 163 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 32 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 22 wks VK, JS Lake Tahoe Golf Course 12 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 1.64 0.5% 0% 0 Grass 13 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 29 wks SH, VK Marshall Golf Discovery 13 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 1.66 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 40 wks SH, VK Marshall Golf Discovery 13 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 40 wks SH, VK Marshall Golf Discovery 14 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 40 wks SH, VK Marshall Golf Discovery 15 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 24 wks SH, VK Marshall Golf Discovery 15 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Yalw x 26 wks JS Sierra-at-Tahoe Ski Area 15 Xeri/Grasscycling 1060 10 0.0% 75% 8 Produce Response to 5/17/04 letter JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A Transcent JG Grocer A J			1000	11	0.0%	0%	0	Grass	75 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 1/yr		
9 Neri/Grasscycling 1000 287 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 65 acres x 0.147 \(\textit{ law x 30 w/ks} \) JS EDH Golf Course			1000	110	0.0%	0%	0	Grass	18/30 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 40/1 wks	SH, VK	EDC Parks & Recreation
10 Neri/Grasscycling 1000 219 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 3.5 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 42 \) wks JS EDHCSD Parks 11 \(Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 162 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 30 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 22 \) wks VK JS Laker Tahoe Golf Course 12 \) Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 1.164 0.5% 0% 0 Grass 32 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 39 \) wks SH, VK Serano Country Club 14 \) Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 1.164 0.5% 0% 0 Grass 198 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 40 \) wks SH, VK Serano Country Club 14 \) Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 1 \) wk Serano Country Club 15 \) Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 133 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 24 \) wks Serano Country Club 15 \) Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 133 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 1 \) wk Serano Country Club 15 \) Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 133 acres x 0.147 \(Valw x 24 \) wks SErano Country Club 15 \) Revise/Exchange 1060 10 0.0% 75% 8 \) Produce Response to 5/17/04 letter JG Grocer A 17 \) Reuse/Exchange 1060 634 0.3% 25% 158 Food Food reuse, livestock feed JS Food Bank of EDC 18 \) Reuse/Exchange 1060 24 0.0% 0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0			1000	287	0.1%	0%	0	Grass	65 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 30 wks	JS	EDH Golf Course
12 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000			1000	219	0.1%	0%	0	Grass	35.5 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 42 wks	JS	EDHCSD Parks
Neri/Grasscycling 1000			1000	162			0	Grass	50 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 22 wks	VK, JS	Lake Tahoe Golf Course
13 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 1,164 0.5% 0% 0 Grass 198 acres x 0.147 Ya/w x 40 wks SH, VK Serrano Country Club 14 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 20 0.0% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Ya/w x 1 wk JS Sierra-at-Tahoe Ski Area 15 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0 Grass 134 acres x 0.147 Ya/w x 26 wks JS Tahoe Paradise GC 16 Reuse/Exchange 1060 10 0.0% 75% 8 Produce Response to 5/17/04 letter JG Grocer A Tahoe Paradise GC 18 Reuse/Exchange 1060 634 0.3% 25% 158 Food Food eruse, livestock feed JS Food Bank of EDC 18 Reuse/Exchange 1060 59 0.0% 50% 29 Bidg Mtls Used construction matis, donations. VK Habitat for Humanity 19 Reuse/Exchange 1060 52 0.0% 0% 0 Produce 105/04 e-mail response JG Grocer B Reuse/Exchange 1060 52 0.0% 0% 0 Produce 105/04 e-mail response JG Grocer B Reuse/Exchange 1060 31 0.0% 75% 23 Goods 90.2% EDC of 33.91 tons JG WERS MRF Reuse Store 22 Thrift Stores 1060 366 0.1% 100% 366 0.1%				183		0%	0		32 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 39 wks		
14 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 20 0.0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%	THE RESERVE AND ADDRESS OF THE PERSON NAMED IN			1,164	0.5%	0%	0	Grass	198 acres x 0.147 t/a/w x 40 wks	SH, VK	Serrano Country Club
15 Xeri/Grasscycling 1000 166 0.1% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0% 0%							0	Grass			
16 Reuse/Exchange 1060 10 0.0% 75% 8 Produce Response to 5/17/04 letter JG Grocer A							0		The state of the s	JS	Tahoe Paradise GC
17 Reuse/Exchange 1060 634 0.3% 25% 158 Food Food reuse, livestock feed JS Food Bank of EDC							8			JG	Grocer A
Reuse/Exchange				634			158			JS	Food Bank of EDC
Reuse/Exchange	-									VK	
Reuse/Exchange 1060 52 0.0% 0% 0 Produce 10/5/04 e-mail response JG Grocer B										JS	Retail Store
Reuse/Exchange							0				Grocer B
Thriff Stores							23			JG	WERS MRF Reuse Store
23 Thrift Stores									90.2% EDC of 405.24 tons	JS	Snowline Hospice Cameron F
24 Thrift Stores	-						831			JS	
25 Thrift Stores							203	Donations	33% EDC of 614 tons	JS	Snowline Hospice Folsom
Total Source Reduction	-						2,215	Donations	90.2% EDC of 2,456 tons	JS	Snowline Hospice Placerville
Total Source Reduction 9,680 3.9% 4,114	-									JS	Snowline Hospice Placerville
Recycling 27 Residential Curbside 2000 5,805 2.4% 100% 5,805 Multiple 91% EDC of 6,374.44 tons JG WERS		The state of the s									
27 Residential Curbside 2000 5,805 2.4% 100% 5,805 Multiple 91% EDC of 6,374.44 tons JG WERS 28 Residential Drop-Off 2010 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 Multiple Included in STR, WERS MRF tons JG STR, WERS 29 Buyback Centers 2020 3,676 1.5% 80% 2,941 CRV 4/27/04 DOC letter for 10 centers JG 10 centers 30 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 80 0.0% 0% 0 Paper Post office uncollected mail JG Collector A 31 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 32 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2			1572			8			BARNETS REPORTED IN A MARKET HE		
29 Buyback Centers 2020 3,676 1.5% 80% 2,941 CRV 4/27/04 DOC letter for 10 centers JG 10 centers 30 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 80 0.0% 0% 0 Paper Post office uncollected mail JG Collector A 31 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 32 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG EDSI 33 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 18 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070			2000	5,805	2.4%	100%	5,805	Multiple	91% EDC of 6,374.44 tons	JG	WERS
29 Buyback Centers 2020 3,676 1.5% 80% 2,941 CRV 4/27/04 DOC letter for 10 centers JG 10 centers 30 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 80 0.0% 0% 0 Paper Post office uncollected mail JG Collector A 31 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 32 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG EDSI 33 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 18 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070	28	Residential Drop-Off	2010	in MRF	0.0%	100%	0	Multiple	Included in STR, WERS MRF tons	JG	STR, WERS
30 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 80 0.0% 0% 0 Paper Post office uncollected mail JG Collector A 31 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 32 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG EDSI 33 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 18 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant	and the same of th			3,676	1.5%	80%	2,941	CRV	4/27/04 DOC letter for 10 centers	JG	10 centers
31 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 32 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG EDSI 33 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 18 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG <								Paper	Post office uncollected mail	JG	Collector A
32 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 CB Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG EDSI 33 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 18 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD	-			in MRF					Included in STR MRF tonnage	JG	STR
33 Commercial Onsite P/U 2030 18 0.0% 0% 0 Paper 50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp SH, VK M.O.R.E. 34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant	-			in MRF						JG	EDSI
34 Commercial Self Haul 2040 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 Multiple Selfhaul to MRF JG WERS 35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant	-		2030		0.0%	0%	. 0	Paper	50% of 36 tons is EDC Unincorp	SH, VK	M.O.R.E.
35 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 2 0.0% 100% 2 GW 370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree JS Cameron Park CSD 36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant											
36 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 100% 0 GW Included in STR MRF tonnage JG STR 37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant				2					370 trees @ 10 lbs/chipped tree	JS	Cameron Park CSD
37 Special/Christmas Trees 2070 in MRF 0.0% 0% 0 GW Included in WERS MRF tonnage JG WERS 38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant				in MRF				GW		JG	STR
38 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 49 0.0% 100% 49 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 54.45 tons/MRF JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant 39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant									the state of the s	JG	WERS
39 Special/Electronic Waste 2070 193 0.1% 100% 193 CRT's 90.2% EDC of 428,600 lbs/4 events JS EDC EMD HD-10 Grant											EDC EMD HD-10 Grant
											EDC EMD HD-10 Grant
			2070	in MRF	0.0%				Included in WERS/STR MRF tons		WERS/STR

	Board Meeting April 11, 2006 T	able 1.	Summ	arv of 20	03 Wa	ste Gen	eration Stu	ıdy for Unincorporated El Dorac	do Coun	Agenda Item 3 Attachment 2a
		PARIS	Tons	% WG		RTons		Method/Conversion		Business/Organization
	Recycling (continued)				A. A HARE.					
	Special Events	2080	424	0.0%	n/a	0	Multiple	90.2% of 470.34 tons	JG	WERS
	Other/Business Recycling	2090	In PR	0.0%	0%	0	Paper	Onsite visit w/ Paper Recycler A	JG	DST Output Technology Sys
43	Other/Business Recycling	2090	In PR	0.0%	0%	0		Onsite visit w/ Paper Recycler A	JG	Fortune 800
44	Other/Business Recycling	2090	78	0.0%	0%	0		6 bales/week @ 500 lbs/bale	JS	Retail Store
45	Other/Business Recycling	2090	In PR	0.0%	0%	0	CB	Onsite visit w/ Paper Recycler A	JG	Longs
46	Other/Business Recycling	2090	36	0.0%	100%	36	Paper	Via Paper Recycler B	DH	St. Stephen's Church
47	Other/Business Recycling	2090	In PR	0.0%	0%	0	CB	Onsite visit w/ Paper Recycler A	JG	Walmart
48	Other/Grocers Recycling	2090	290	0.1%	0%	0	CB, PI	Response to 5/17/04 letter	JG	Grocer A
49	Other/Grocers Recycling	2090	473	0.2%	0%	0	Multiple	2 stores @ 236.52 tons/store	JG	Grocer B
50	Other/Grocers Recycling	2090	195	0.1%	0%	0	CB, P	Compacted plastic; baled CB	JS	Grocer C/Cameron Park
51	Other/Grocers Recycling	2090	128	0.1%	0%	0	CB, P	Compacted plastic; baled CB	JS	Grocer C/Pollock Pines
	MRF (ERL/TTDC)	7000	335	0.1%	50%	167	Multiple	2.02% of ERL MRF Diversion	JG	ERL MRF in Truckee Area
_	MRF (Paper Recycler A)	7000	7,896	3.2%	0%	0	Multiple	Onsite visit w/ Paper Recycler A	JG	Paper Recycler A
	MRF (STR)	7000	472	0.2%	53%	250	Multiple	See MRF diversion by material	JG	STR MRF Processing
	MRF (WERS)	7000	3,968	1.6%	80%	3,175		90.2% EDC of 4,400.07 tons	JG	WERS
	MRF (Amador Disposal)	7000	3,900	0.0%	50%	3,173	Multiple	See MRF diversion by material	JG	Western Amador Recycling
-		7010	1.064	0.0%	0%	0	Various	Sac County WM&RD Records	JG	Kiefer Landfill
57	Landfill Diversion	7010	1,964	0.0%	0%	0	Various	Sac County WM&RD Records	JG	North Area Recovery Station
58	Transfer Station Diversion	1575-1500001-5	24		50%	12	GW	CIWMB Disposal Reporting System		Forward Landfill
	ADC	7040	7	0.0%	50%	4	GW			Kiefer Landfill
	ADC	7040		0.0%	50%	4	GW	CIWMB Disposal Reporting System	Contract Con	Western Regional SLF
61	ADC	7040	00.454	0.0%	50%	40.005	GVV	CIWMB Disposal Reporting System	CIVVIVID	Western Regional Sci
THE STATE OF	Total Recycling		26,151	10.6%		12,635			Corpia de La Cara	
00	Composting	0000	WEDO	0.00/	4000/		CVAZ	In Diamage & Compact Facility	ic	WERS MRF Processing
	Residential Curbside	3000	WERS	0.0%	100%	0	GW	In Biomass & Compost Facility	JG JG	
63	Residential Self Haul	3010	in MRF	0.0%	0%	0	GW	Included in STR MRF tonnage		STR Processing at MRF
64	Commercial Onsite Pickup	3020	in MRF	0.0%	0%	0		Included in STR MRF tonnage	JG	STR Processing at MRF
65	Commercial Self Haul, D/O	3030	in MRF	0.0%	0%	0		Included in STR MRF tonnage	JG	STR Processing at MRF
66	Food Waste Composting	3040	101	0.0%	0%	0	15. STATE 1577 I	2 stores @ 50.26 tons/store	JG	Grocer B (EDH, CP)
67	Food Waste Composting	3040	109	0.0%	0%	0		Produce trim, bakery items, etc.	JS	Grocer C/Cameron Park
68	Food Waste Composting	3040	109	0.0%	0%	0		Produce trim, bakery items, etc.	JS	Grocer C/Pollock Pines
69	Other/Chip, Grind, Reuse	3070	45	0.0%	0%	0		180 cy @ 108 pcy	JS, JG	EDC DOT Property
	Other/Chip, Grind, Reuse	3070	1,245	0.5%		1,245		622,269 cu ft @ 108 pcy	JG	EDC Fire Safe Council
	Other/Chip, Grind, Reuse	3070	10	0.0%				180 cy @ 108 pcy at Fairgrounds	JS	EDC Parks & Recreation
72	Other/Chip, Grind, Reuse	3070	53	0.0%		0		Diversion Survey	JS	Lake Valley Fire Dept
73	Other/Chip, Grind, Reuse	3070	23,210	9.4%		. 0		Sold for landscaping	JG, JS	Lumber Products Company
	Other/Chip, Grind, Reuse	3070	186	0.1%		0	1000	WERS through Howe Industries		WERS MRF Processing
	Other/Tree Trimmings Srvc	3070	175	0.1%		0	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	JS Survey	JS	Tree Trimmer A
	Other/Tree Trimmings Srvc	3070	557	0.2%		0		90% EDC*11,440 cy @ 108 pcy	JS	Tree Trimmer B
77	Other/Tree Trimmings Srvc	3070	7	0.0%		0		90% EDC*150 cy @ 108 pcy	VK	Tree Trimmer C
-		3070	164	0.1%		164		45 horses @ 20 pounds/horse/day	JG	Rancher
79	Compost Facility	7030	1,635	0.7%				90%EDC x 20% x 9065tons Y/WW	JG	WERS to WMI/K & M
	Total Composting		27,606	11.2%		1,409				

Board Meeting Agenda Item 3 Summary of 2003 Waste Generation Study for Unincorporated El Dorado County Table 1. April 11, 2006 Attachment 2a % WG % Res RTons Material Method/Conversion Record Business/Organization Component/Program **PARIS** Tons Special Waste 100% EDC/Silva Ranch Land App EDSI to Synagro 3.1% 0% JG 80 Sludge Reuse 7,556 Biosolids 4010 0% 6,281 tires @ 20 lbs/tire JG Tire Store in EDH 0.0% 81 Tire Recycling 4020 63 Rubber 60% of 9,895 tires @ 20 lbs/tire 59 0.0% 0% Rubber JS **EDC Tire Amnesty Day** Tire Recycling 4020 23% See STR MRF diversion by material STR MRF Processing 21 0.0% Rubber JG 83 Tire Recycling 4020 WERS MRF Processing 84 Tire Recycling 74 JG 4020 0.0% 0% 0 Tires 90.2% EDC x 82.56 tons 0 Appliances Included in MRF tonnage JG Via STR and WERS MRF's White Goods 4030 in MRF 0.0% 100% See STR MRF diversion by material JG STR MRF Processing Scrap Metals Processing 0.1% 25% 4040 167 42 Metal WERS MRF Processing 2% See WERS MRF diversion by matl JG Scrap Metals Processing 2.315 0.9% 46 Metal 4040 JS Retail Store Wood Waste 4040 24 0.0% 0% Pallets Phone survey JG, JS Lumber Company (sawdust) 10,053 4.1% 0% Sold for particle board manufacture 89 Wood Waste 4050 Sawdust 3.9% 0% JG. JS Lumber Company (shavings) 4050 9,528 Sold for particle board manufacture Shavings Wood Waste JG, JS Lumber Company (chips) 29,762 12.1% 0% Sold for paper manufacture 91 Wood Waste 4050 Chips JG, JS Lumber Company (chips) Wood Waste 4050 1,394 0.6% 0% 0 Shavg, HW Sold for slashboard manufacture 65.2% 37% 334 See STR MRF diversion by material STR Processing at MRF 4050 911 Wood JG 93 Wood Waste 1.6% 0% 10/5/04 phone survey (80 tons/wk) Inerts Recycler 4,000 JG 94 Asphalt/Concrete/Rubble 4060 Concrete 1.0% 4060 2,500 0% JS Survey (road grindings recycling) JS EDC DOT 95 Asphalt/Concrete/Rubble Asphalt Construction Contractor 883 0.4% 0% 0 C&D JS phonecon w/ company 96 Asphalt/Concrete/Rubble 4060 10% See STR MRF diversion by material JG STR Processing at MRF 1.2% 97 Asphalt/Concrete/Rubble 4060 2.987 299 Rubble WERS MRF Processing 2.270 Included in WERS MRF tonnage 98 Asphalt/Concrete/Rubble 0.0% 0% Rubble 4060 Grocer A (Missouri Flat) Response to 5/17/04 letter 4090 0.0% 0% 0 Food JG 99 Rendering 5 0% 20% EDC of 3 tons SH, VK Renderer A 0.0% Animals 100 Rendering 4090 1 0% 2 stores @ 17.39 tons/store 35 0 JG Grocer B 4090 0.0% Bone, fat 101 Rendering 20% EDC/animal fat, grease, bones SH, VK Renderer B 102 Rendering 4090 6 0.0% 0% 0 Food 0.3% 0% 0 Food Butcher scraps, grease, oil. SH, VK Renderer C 4090 648 103 Rendering **Total Special Waste** 30.6% 726 75.263 18,883 TOTAL DIVERSION 138,699 56.3% 14% Disposal CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 0.0% 0 Waste 104 Arvin SLF 0.0% CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 105 Azusa LF 27 0.0% 0 Waste 0.0% CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 106 B&J Dropbox SLF 34 0.0% 0.0% 0 Waste CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 0.0% 107 Bena (Bakersfield) LF 0.0% Waste CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 108 Export Out of State 38.1% 50.0% 46,857 Waste 93,714 CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 109 Forward LF 4,438 1.8% 0.0% Waste CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 2.4% 50.0% 5.937 2.969 Waste 110 Kiefer LF CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 111 L&D LF 1.848 0.8% 50.0% 924 Waste CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 112 North County LF (SJC) 86 0.0% 0.0% Waste CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 113 Union Mine DS 0.6% 0.0% 0 Waste 1.397 CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 19 114 WRSL 38 0.0% 50.0% Waste CIWMB Disposal Reporting System 115 Yolo County LF 0.0% 0.0% Waste TOTAL DISPOSAL 107.532 43.7% 47.2% 50,769 10.04 pounds/person/day (total) 134,400 = DOF 2003 Population (1/1/04) **TOTAL GENERATION** 246,231 28.3% 69,652 2.84 pounds/person/day (resider DIVERSION RATE 56.3%

Table 1. Summary of 2003 Waste Generation Study for Unincorporated El Dorado County

Agenda Item 3 Attachment 2a

Component/Program	PARIS	Tons	% WG	% Res	RTons	Material	Method/Conversion	Record	Business/Organization
Transformation/Biomass									
116 Transformation/Biomass	8010	323	0.3%	80%	258	Wood	2.02% of 15,970.83 tons	JG	ERL, Inc.
117 Transformation/Biomass	8010	5,982	2.4%	0%	0	Wood	Sold for use as hog fuel.	JG, JS	Lumber Products Company
118 Transformation/Biomass	8010	6,541	2.7%	80%	5,233	Wood,GW	90%EDC x 80% x 9065tons Y/WW	JG	WMI/K&M
Total Biomass Tonnage		12,846	5.2%		5,233		< 10% of waste generation		
119 Diversion w/o Biomass		138,699					Diversion w/o Lumber Products Con	npany	64,752
120 Waste Generation w/o Bion	nass	246,231					Waste Generation w/o Lumber Com	pany	172,284
121 Diversion Rate w/o Biomas	S	56.3%					Diversion Rate w/o Lumber Compan	ıy	37.58%
122 Biomass Diversion Tons	T	12,846	5.2%				DR w/ Biomass w/o Lumber Compa	ny	41.38%
Diversion Rate w/ Biomas	SS		61.5%						
							Residential Diversion Rate		27.11%
							Non Residential Div Rate		67.85%
	1								
								-	
	-			-				 	

10. For each restricted waste type [i.e., agricultural waste, inert solids, (e.g. concreter, asphalt, dirt, etc.) scrap metals and white goods (PRC Section 41781.2)] and associated program, please provide the following information:

a. If the diversion program started on or after January 1, 1990, complete the following table.

(Note: program name refers to one specific diversion program for that waste type; (e.g., diversion conducted by City

Public Waste Dept).

Restricted Waste Type	Specific Program nar	me	Year started	Tonnage	
Metals	STR MRF		1995	167	
Metals	WERS MRF		1995	2315	
Inerts	Inerts Recycler		1999	4000	
Inerts	EDC DOT	Early 1990's		2500	
Inerts	Construction Company		2003	883	
Inerts	STR MRF		1995	2987	
Inerts	WERS MRF		1995	2270	

 b. If the diversion program started before January 1, 1990, on a separate sheet, marked attachment 10b, provide the 	3
following documentation: (Note: If documentation for a waste type and program has already been approved by the	
Board, you do not have to provide an attachment 10b for that waste type and program. Instead please provide date of Board approval of preciously submitted information.	(Date)
If documentation is not available, go to 10d.	

- How the diversion was the result of a local action taken by the jurisdiction, which specifically resulted in the diversion [PRC Sec. 41781.2 (c) (1)].
- That the amount of that waste type diverted from the jurisdiction in 1990 was less than or equal to the amount of that waste type disposed at a permitted disposal facility by the jurisdiction in any year before 1990. (Note: this criterion is applicable to the entire jurisdiction, not to individual programs [PRC Sec. 41781.2 (c) (2)]).
- The jurisdiction is implementing, and will continue to implement, the diversion programs in its Source Reduction and Recycling Element.

c. If the diversion program started before January 1, 1990, and the documentation requested in 10b is available (but not

yet approved by the Board), complete the table below for each program claimed:

Restricted Waste Type	Specific Program Name	New base year or reporting year diversion tonnage

d. If the diversion program started before January 1, 1990, and the documentation requested in 10b is not available, please complete the table below for each program claimed. (*Note*: Only the difference between the new base vear/reporting year and 1990 can be counted in the diversion rate calculation.)

Restricted Waste Type	Specific Program name	New base year or reporting year tonnage	1990 diversion tonnage	Difference
pull down for waste types				
pull down for waste types				
pull down for waste types				
pull down for waste types				
pull down for waste types				
pull down for waste types				